



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/735,335	12/11/2000	Paul C. Ross	1-3	5430

27997 7590 04/06/2005

PRIEST & GOLDSTEIN PLLC
5015 SOUTHPARK DRIVE
SUITE 230
DURHAM, NC 27713-7736

EXAMINER

OUELLETTE, JONATHAN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3629

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/735,335

Applicant(s)

ROSS, PAUL C.

Examiner

Jonathan Ouellette

Art Unit

3629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. The Request filed on 2/17/2005 for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/735,335 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. **Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-12, 14-15, 17-21, and 23-27 are rejected under 35**

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ernst et al. (US 5,636,245)

4. As per **independent Claims 1, 6, 17, and 23**, Ernst discloses a method [telecommunications terminal] of operating a telecommunications terminal, said method comprising: receiving a plurality of geographically-sensitive messages (C1 L61-67, C2 L1-24, C2 L59-62) broadcasted to a plurality of telecommunication terminals (C3 L41-45, plurality of remote units), and the plurality of geographically-sensitive messages having associated geographic locations of relevance (C3 10-30, Incorporation unit); ascertaining a geographic location of said telecommunications terminal (C3 L31-45, remote unit); determining a geographic region of interest of said

telecommunications terminal based on said geographic location of said telecommunications terminal; determining whether the geographic location of relevance are within [overlapping] said geographic region of interest of said telecommunications terminal; and filtering out the geographically-sensitive messages whose associated geographic locations of relevance are not within [overlapping] said geographic region of interest of said telecommunications terminal (C3 L46-65, Matching Processor, process and disseminate information).

5. As per Claims 2, 7, 18, and 24, Ernst discloses wherein said telecommunication terminal is mobile; and wherein said geographic region of interest is based on said geographic location of said telecommunications terminal and on a direction of motion of said telecommunications terminal (C3 L31-65, Direction of motion is a product of position, velocity and time).
6. As per Claims 3, 8, 20, and 26, Ernst discloses wherein said telecommunication terminal is mobile; and wherein said geographic region of interest is based on said geographic location of said telecommunications terminal and on a speed of said telecommunications terminal (Claim 6).
7. As per Claims 4, 9, 21, and 27, Ernst discloses wherein said geographic region of interest is based on a priority of said geographically-sensitive message (C3 L37-45, event specific tags – prioritizing events/messages; Claims 17-18, changing region of influence).
8. As per Claims 19 and 25, Ernst discloses wherein said receiver is also for receiving a definition of said geographic region of relevance, and further comprising a memory

for storing said definition of said geographic region of relevance and an indicium of said geographic region of relevance as an index into said memory (C3 L46-65, Matching Processor; Claim 1 and Claim 17, Regions of interest/region of influence).

9. As per **independent Claims 11 and 14**, Ernst discloses a method [telecommunications terminal] of operating a telecommunications terminal to filter geographically-sensitive messages which are broadcasted to a plurality of telecommunication terminals (Abstract; C3 L41-45, plurality of remote units), said method comprising: receiving a plurality of broadcasted geographically-sensitive messages having associated geographic regions of relevance (C1 L61-67; C2 L1-24; C2 L59-62; Claim 17, region of influence); ascertaining a geographic location of said telecommunications terminal; and determining whether said geographic location of said telecommunications terminal is within the geographic region of relevance; and disregarding the broadcasted geographically-sensitive messages when said geographic location of said telecommunications terminal is not within the corresponding geographic region of relevance of the geographically-sensitive message (Claim 1; C3 L46-65, Matching Processor, process and disseminate information).
10. As per Claims 12 and 15, Ernst discloses receiving a definition of each geographic region of relevance and an indicium of said geographic region of relevance before receiving said geographically-sensitive message; and storing said definition of said geographic region of relevance into memory with said indicium of said geographic

region of relevance as an index into said memory (C3 L46-65, Matching Processor;
Claim 1 and Claim 17, Regions of interest/region of influence).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. **Claims 5, 10, 13, 16, 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being
unpatentable over Ernst.**

13. As per Claim 5, 10, 13, 16, 22 and 28, Ernst does not expressly show wherein said
geographic region of interest comprises at least one of a polygon and a conic section.

14. However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material
and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The telecommunications
terminal operating system would be performed regardless of the shape of geographic
region of interest used. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the
claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703
F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32
USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

15. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time
the invention was made to have used a geographic region of interest in a shape
comprising at least one of a polygon and a conic section, because such data does not

functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 2/17/2005, regarding Claims 1-28, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Ouellette whose telephone number is (703) 605-0662 ((571) 272-6807 effective April 13, 2005). The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8am - 5:00pm.
18. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (703) 308-2702. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306 for all official communications.
19. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5484.



Application/Control Number: 09/735,335

Page 7

Art Unit: 3629

jo

March 29, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "jo", written over the date "March 29, 2005".A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "John G. Weiss", written above the printed name.

JOHN G. WEISS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600